

REMARKS

The Examiner rejected claims 4, 5, and 6 as indefinite, claims 1, 4, 7-10 and 13 as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,549,637 to Crainich, claims 2 and 6 as being obvious over Crainich in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,472,451 to Freitas, and claims 11 and 12 as being obvious over Crainich in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,147,357 to Rose. Claims 3 and 6 were objected to as being dependent from a rejected claim but were deemed otherwise allowable.

Applicant has made appropriate corrections to claims 4 and 6, eliminating "preferably" and therefore removing the language that Examiner asserted made said claims indefinite. Thus, claims 9 and 11 should now be allowable. With respect to claim 5, the rejection should be obviated by the amendment to claim 4, from which claim 5 depends. As such, claim 5 should also now be allowable.

Regarding the rejections based upon prior art, Applicant has made appropriate amendments to claim 1. Specifically, claim 1 now contains limitations previously contained in claim 3. Applicant believes that the limitations taken from claim 3 (which Examiner indicated contained allowable subject matter) and now present in claim 1 are not taught in the prior art cited by the Examiner. As such, claim 1 should now be allowable. As claims 2 through 13 depend from claim 1, those claims should therefore also be allowable. New claim 14 has further limitations beyond those contained claim 1 and also should therefore be allowable. New claim 14 finds support in at least original claims 1, 2, and 6.

CONCLUSION


In view of the foregoing, the Applicant is of the view that the pending claims, as amended, are in allowable form. Favorable reconsideration is requested. The allowance of this application is earnestly solicited.



Date: March 5, 2007

MAYER, BROWN, ROWE & MAW LLP
P.O. Box 2828
Chicago, IL 60690-2828
(312) 782-0600
Customer Number 26565

Respectfully submitted,


Robert S. Rigg, Reg. No. 36,991